



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

BGS

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------

09/609,891 07/05/00 LUCIANO

J LE9-00-044

EXAMINER

021972 WM31/1003
LEXMARK INTERNATIONAL INC
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY LAW DEPARTMENT
740 WEST NEW CIRCLE ROAD
LEXINGTON KY 40550

GARCIA, G
ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2624
DATE MAILED:

5
10/03/01

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Office Action Summary

Application No.
09/609,891

Applicant(s)
Luclano et al.

Examiner
G. Garcia

Art Unit
2624

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE three MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 (a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 35 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-23 is/are pending in the application
- 4a) Of the above, claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-23 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claims _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirements

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner.
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- *See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

Attachment(s)

- 15) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 16) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 17) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). 4
- 18) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 19) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 20) ☐ Other:

Part III DETAILED ACTION

1. This application has been examined. Claims 1-23 are pending in this application.

2. Applicant is reminded of the proper language and format for an abstract of the disclosure.

The form and legal phraseology often used in patent claims, such as "**comprises**" should be avoided. The abstract should describe the disclosure sufficiently to assist readers in deciding whether there is a need for consulting the full patent text for details.

3. The Abstract of the Disclosure is objected to because it contains the objectionable language described above. See MPEP § 608.01(b).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of

section 371© of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

5. Claims 1,2 and 6-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Stephenson (5,949,469).

With regard to claim 1, Stephenson teaches a photoprinter configuration (see figure 3) comprising: a digital camera (10) comprising a viewable display (18) and one or more selection mechanisms (20,22 or 14); and a photoprinter (12) connected to the digital camera via a communication link (see col. 4, lines 20-23), the photoprinter being operative to control the viewable display of the digital camera (see col. 4, lines 20-65).

With regard to claim 2, Stephenson teaches the photoprinter is further operative to direct a result from a user's input to the selection mechanisms (see col. 4).

With regard to claim 6, Stephenson further comprising a means for controlling the digital camera by the photoprinter (see col. 4).

With regard to method claims 7-12, the limitations of claims 7-12 are taught by the means of claims 1,2 and 6 that provide the functions steps claimed in claims 7-12.

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 3 and 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stephenson (5,949,469) as applied to claim 1 above.

With regard to claim 3, Stephenson teaches using a communication link between the camera and the printer (see details in claim 1 above), but fails to teach that the communication link is a universal serial bus). Examiner takes official notice (MPEP 2144.03) that it is well known in the art of photo printing to use a universal serial bus between a photoprinter and a digital camera. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide the system as taught by Stephenson with a universal serial bus because of the following reasons: a) in order to standardize the system as taught by Stephenson, to comply with industry standards; and b) by using industry standards allows the system to be used with different compatible devices.

With regard to claim 5, Stephenson teaches fails to explicitly teach using an open operating system. Examiner takes official notice (MPEP 2144.03) that it is well known in the art of digital cameras to use an open operating system. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide the camera as taught by Stephenson with an open operating system because of the following reasons: a) in order to standardize the system to control the different hardware and software resources; and b) in order to manage the digital camera more efficiently using an operating system such as windows NT or unix).

8. Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stephenson (5,949,469) as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Hanada (6,000,864).

With regard to claim 4, Stephenson teaches using a communication link between the camera and the printer (see details in claim 1 above), but fails to teach using a wireless communication link. Hanada teaches that it is well known in the art to transmit data between a digital camera and a printer using wireless means (see abstract). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the apparatus of Stephenson with means to transmit data wirelessly, in order to send information

between the camera and the printer without using wires, reducing the complication of making the connections between the camera and the printer, and in order to send information between the camera and the printer when both are located in relatively different remote locations.

9. Claims 13-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stephenson (5,949,469) as applied to claims 1-6 above, and further in view of Taniguchi et al. (5,999,707).

With regard to claims 13-20, the limitations of claims 13-20 are covered by the limitations of claims 1-6 above and Stephenson fails teach the printer as being operable as a client to a host computer. Taniguchi et al. teaches that it is well known in the art to make a printer operate as a client to a host computer (see abstract). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the system as taught by Stephenson with a host and allowing the printer to operate as a host to the printer because of the following reasons: a) in order to allow the printer of Stephenson to select information from the host as to operate the digital camera and to control information between the camera and the host computer; and b) in order to allow the printer of Stephenson to be an intelligent printer that allows the

manipulation of the camera and the receiving of information from the host.

With regard to claims 21-23, the limitations of claims 21-23 are covered by the limitations of claims 1-6 and 13 above.

Conclusion

10. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Ozawa et al. (6,155,137) teaches an image processing system, digital camera, and printing apparatus.

Suzuki et al. (6,104,886) teaches a print system and an electronic camera system.

Hatakenaka et al. (6,075,949) teaches an electronic camera connected to a printer.

Liang (5,928,341) teaches a dynamic printer port switcher for selectively connecting at least two peripheral devices to a PC having a printer port.

Fukushima (5,903,700) teaches an information recording/reproducing apparatus capable of changing its operations based on characteristic data of a camera connected thereto.

Stephenson (5,802,413) teaches a printer receiving electronic camera.

Serial Number: 09/609,891

Art Unit: 2624

8

11. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Gabriel I. Garcia whose telephone number is (703) 305-8751. The examiner can normally be reached Monday thru Thursday from 7:30AM-6:00PM.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 306-0377.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks
Washington, DC 20231

or faxed to:

(703) 872-9314 (official or unofficial)

Gabriel I. Garcia
Primary Examiner
September 28, 2001


GABRIEL GARCIA
PRIMARY EXAMINER